

RUPEE SERIES



BHAVAN'S BOOK UNIVERSITY

**LINGUISTIC VIVISECTION
OF INDIA**

WHY NOT STOP IT STILL ?

V. B. Kamath

GENERAL EDITORS

K. M. MUNSHI

R. R. DIWAKAR



BHARATIYA VIDYA BHAVAN, BOMBAY

FOREWORD

Many of us who advocated the formation of linguistic States are compelled, by recent events, to reconsider as to how far this has helped to forge unity. The intention of the Congress leaders who emphasised on the formation of States on a linguistic basis was to enable the general public carry on administrations in their own language and it was thought that the formation of these States would not in any way affect adversely the unity of India. Further, it was felt that it would help the integration of different States and promote unity and engender a sense of dedication of all to the nation as such. Equally, the formation of linguistic States was considered necessary to promote both the economic and social interests of particular regions. I have always held the view that but for the formation of these States we could not have got the local natural resources or economic potentialities fully developed both in the interests of the particular regions and that of the entire country. I have always considered that the formation of linguistic States was a stage through which we had necessarily to pass in our political development.

Linguistic States have indeed contributed their part for the economic regeneration of different areas. For example, but for the formation of Andhra, perhaps the Tungabhadra and Nagarjunasagar Projects could not have been so quickly developed, and the Hirakud Project without Orissa taking a keen interest, might have taken decades for execution. Even when the States Reorganisation Commission Report was discussed in Parliament, I emphasised that while it was a necessary step to assure the different linguistic groups their separate States, they should lead after some period to the formation of Zonal States resulting ultimately in a unitary form of Government. In fact, I wrote to Pantji, the then Home Minister, about my views on Zonal States. While he

felt this was not possible at that time, at any rate, he organised the Zonal Councils which have to some extent helped to discuss and solve regional problems both in the economic and political spheres.

The recent border disputes and agitations for the formation of linguistic States and the inter-State rivalries leading to violence, bitterness and disorders have become not only a problem of law and order but even threaten to subvert the unity of India, generating hostility and hatred by people of one State against another. Many of us have come to feel that we should put a stop to this and reverse the trend. This tendency of linguistic feelings trying to get the better and threatening to disrupt the unity of India should certainly be ended once and for all. When we are faced with many problems which can be solved only by united action and efforts, it would be suicidal for the entire country if people behave in parochial and sectarian terms.

I am heartened to note that many people are realising that the linguistic States have fulfilled their role and now is the time for us to emphasise on unity. In this, the book by Prof. Kamath which analyses the genesis of the formation of linguistic States, and equally discusses the problem of the *lingua franca*, will be useful in the general public understanding the various forces that operate and the dangers that might befall us if we try to give undue prominence to satisfy linguistic and regional interests. One might not perhaps agree with many of the points he has made, but we cannot deny that the book deserves a careful attention and study by all those who believe in the unity of India. I am sure this book will receive the attention of the general public in the country.

Raj Bhavan,
Bangalore.
August 16, 1966

V. V. GIRI
Governor of Mysore.

PREFACE

Contrary to the normal convention and common courtesy of terminal thanking, I would like to express first my heart-felt gratitude to my good old friend Mr. J. T. Desai, Solicitor, popularly known in our circle as Babubhai. But for his initiative, drive and follow up, this booklet could not have seen the light of the day.

Public of the Sovereign Democratic Republic of India need not get stunned when I say that we have had to run from pillar to post to locate a timely and good publisher. Hence we naturally feel deeply indebted to the Bharatiya Vidya Bhavan, and to Dr. K. M. Munshi in particular, for coming to our rescue in agreeing to publish it in the One Rupee Book University Series.

Mr. V. V. Giri, now Governor of Mysore, with whom I have been associated for many years, specially in respect of labour welfare and social work programmes, in his address to the Rotary Club, Bombay, in June this year opposed the Reorganization of States purely on linguistic lines and supported the formation of administrative zones. Earlier in April I was given an opportunity of addressing the same club on "Menace of Linguism". Mr. Giri, who read my speech and the article, was kind enough to suggest that the latter deserves to be given wide publicity in a booklet form. It is therefore most appropriate that the Foreword should emanate from His Excellency's powerful pen.

To make my approach to the linguistic problem as comprehensive and complete, as is humanly possible, within the limitation of space, I ventured to quote liberally from the reports of important commissions, committees and conferences like Dar, JVP, SRC, All Party and the opinions expressed by prominent personalities such as Gandhiji, Nehru, Ambed-

kar, simultaneously stating my own personal opinions with neither fear nor favour.

I believe a popular movement for achieving national solidarity should be generated with the same fervour as was done during our struggle for Poorna Swaraj. For India can survive only if all of us, irrespective of caste or creed, religion, or region, language or culture, sex or status, consider ourselves to be Indians first and Indians last; in fact we all are Unitary citizens of this great and glorious land of ours which under no circumstances should be allowed to be further disintegrated.

If you resonate to this idea, please do share these views with as many citizens of India as you can and do contribute your mite towards this dear, worthy and crucial cause. Instead of cursing darkness let us light a few candles and remain firm in our 'Indian' faith, notwithstanding the onslaught of narrow nationalism and regional patriotism which seem to be on the wax.

Here now in your hands is the booklet—"Linguistic Vivisection of India—Why not Stop it Still?"—which may satisfy your intellectual curiosity and prompt you to do your very best to stop this vivisection.

Your suggestions towards the achievement of this most vital national goal are eagerly and sincerely solicited.

Hira Mahal,
171 Shivaji Park,
Road No. 5,
Bombay-16 (DD).
August, 1966

VASUDEVA B. KAMATH

CONTENTS

	Page
Foreword	vii
Preface	ix
Prelude	1
Integration of States	2
Three Precious Gifts	3
False Foundations of Linguistic States	4
All Parties Conference	6
Congress Reaffirmation	7
Gandhiji's View	7
Dar Commission	10
Punjab Commission	12
Border Problem	13
D. C. Recommendations	14
J. V. P. Committee	15
Other Parties	17
Andhra State	17
Constitutional Position	18
States Reorganisation Commission	19
Terms of Reference	20
Factors for Consideration—S.R.C.	21
Recommends Reorganisation	23
Reorganised States	24
Bilingual States	25
Opinion of Youth	26
Further Moves	27
Why Split up Punjab?	28
Future	29
Official Language	30
Dr. B. R. Ambedkar	33
Defence and Development	35
Middle Path	38
Dispassionate and Objective Study	39
Suggestions	39

PRELUDE

As in the life of men, so in the life of a nation, there are periods of crucial significance which can make or mar their whole future. There are sufficient sure signs to show that India is now passing through some such critical period which may determine the destiny of generations to follow. In our pre-Independence era it was but natural for our popular and patriotic leaders to make solemn declarations and pristine promises with the main object of rousing the emotions and sentiments of the masses with a view to getting their unqualified vigorous support for our liberation movement. Another apparent intention was to advance sound evidence to the people of India, as also to the world outside, that nothing was right with the British rulers and the earlier the foreigners were made to leave the shores of India, lock, stock and barrel, the better it would be for Indians to set their own house in order. Dr. Albert Einstein speaking about the partition of India and Palestine, had rightly remarked, "Trouble making is a British Enterprise; Palestine is a Miniature Model of India." No action of Great Britain has done to the Indian sub-Continent more perennial harm than the parting kick of partition by dividing India into an Islamic State of Pakistan—a Home land for such Indian Muslims who were desirous of living in isolation—and the residual India, also known as Bharat. It is the same India whose variety and unity was described by our undisputed leader Jawaharlal Nehru in the following picturesque words traced in his world famous 'The Discovery of India':

"It is fascinating to find how the Bengalis, the Marathas, the Gujaratis, the Tamils, the Andhras, the Oriyas, the Assamese, the Canarese, the Malayalis, the Sindhis, the

Punjabis, the Pathans, the Kashmiris, the Rajputs, and the great central block comprising the Hindustani-speaking people, have retained their peculiar characteristics for hundreds of years, have still more or less the same virtues and failings of which old tradition or record tells us, and yet have been throughout these ages distinctively Indian, with the same national heritage and the same set of moral and mental qualities. There was something living and dynamic about this heritage which showed itself in ways of living and a philosophical attitude to life and its problems. Foreign influences poured in and often influenced that culture and were absorbed. Disruptive tendencies gave rise immediately to an attempt to find a synthesis. Some kind of a dream of unity has occupied the mind of India since the dawn of civilization. That unity was not conceived as something imposed from outside, a standardization of externals or even of beliefs. It was something deeper and, within its fold, the widest tolerance of belief and custom was practised and every variety acknowledged and even encouraged."

INTEGRATION OF STATES

Having therefore divided such a solid State as a result of factors over which we did not possess enough control, do we now want to create conditions on our own in a manner that would result in the continuation of that painful process with the help of a more modern weapon and a pseudo scientific instrument of language, when those old pangs are still being felt and the wounds yet to be completely healed, despite the recent Tashkent Declaration? For any further Balkanisation of India, we cannot justifiably blame any Power or party except ourselves or at best our past emotional commitments

which we have every right to amend or annul in the changed circumstances. It won't be right in any way to blame the British now. The British devil must indeed be given the due. Among the few worthy exceptional assets left behind by the Foreign Power, could be included a unified British India. On August 15, 1947, though about 552 Indian "Princely" States with a population of about 51 million were left free by the British Parliament to make their own choice of linking themselves with the new India's National Government or join Pakistan or even remain sovereign principalities, thanks to our strong-willed and iron-handed Sardar Vallabhbhai Patel, the first Home Minister of Independent India, that Princely States' problem by and large was settled satisfactorily with little bloodshed. No doubt the Kashmir issue, *de jure*, is still resting in the Security Council and the emotional integration of the old Portuguese Colony of Goa is yet to be achieved.

THREE PRECIOUS GIFTS

Nevertheless unity of British Indian Provinces, the modern human instrument of the Parliamentary System of Democracy and the international vehicle of communication viz., the English Language, are the three lasting assets left behind by the alien rule, which had consolidated itself over a period of about two centuries by adopting the special technique of "divide and rule"; but neither the British India nor the British Empire could stand the tide of time notwithstanding the declaration of Mr. Winston Churchill to the effect "I have not become the first Minister of Great Britain to preside over the liquidation of the British Empire". This Empire within which at one time the sun never set, is now liquidated into a Commonwealth of Nations of which the sovereign Democratic Republic of India is an equal partner. On 26th

January 1930, the Indian National Congress had enriched the earlier goal of Dominion Status to Purna Swaraj, or complete Independence. Therefore to cast away these three unsolicited blessings in disguise thrust on us by the British System, is nothing but throwing away the baby with the bath.

FALSE FOUNDATIONS OF LINGUISTIC STATES

Among the important promises given by our leaders during the national struggle for freedom, is the re-organisation of States on a linguistic basis. The false foundations for this ghastly structure could be traced back to the formation on a linguistic basis of Circles and Committees by the Indian National Congress. In the words of Dr. Pattabhi Sitaramayya, the Congress Historian:

"A new resolution accepted by the Calcutta Congress was the one relating to Andhra being recognised as a separate Congress circle, and in this connection we may make a reference to a National or subnational movement which was inaugurated in the Andradesa in 1913 and which travelled on to the Congress of 1915. The movement related to the question of redistributing the Indian Provinces on linguistic lines. It had its origin really in the efforts made by Mahesh Narayan of Bihar in 1894 to get his province separated from Bengal. The Congress created Bihar into a separate Province in 1908, and the principle was approved in the Scheme of Provincial Autonomy set forth in the Government of India's Despatch of August 25, 1911, and Bihar separated from Bengal as the result of that despatch. Wide and strong was the belief that for Provincial Autonomy to be successful, the medium of instruction as well as administration must be the provincial languages, and that the failure of the British Administration, notably

in the domain of Local Self Government, is undoubtedly due to the pell-mell admixture of populations in British Provinces which are carved out on no logical or ethnological, but on a chronological basis. In 1915 the Congress was not prepared to deal with the question but it was pressed to the fore in 1916 by the Andhra Conference, and to anticipate events, we may say that on the 8th of April, 1917, the All India Congress Committee to which it was referred by the Lucknow Congress (1916) accepted the principle after duly consulting the Provincial Congress Committees of Madras and Bombay, and resolved that the "Telugu speaking districts of the Madras Presidency be constituted into a separate Congress Province. Sindh followed suit and Karnataka came later. The subject was hotly contested in the Subjects Committee of the Calcutta Congress (1917). Even Gandhi thought that the question might await the implementing of the Reforms, but Lokamanya Tilak saw the point, namely that Linguistic Provinces were an essential condition prerequisite to real Provincial Autonomy. Mrs. Beasant presided over the Calcutta Congress (1917) and the idea was opposed vehemently by her as well as by some Tamil friends from the South. The subject held the field for over two hours in Calcutta, and was ultimately accepted late at night at 10.15 p.m. Sindh was recognised as a separate Congress circle by the A.I.C.C. on 6th October 1917."

At the important Nagpur Session of 1920, the Congress formally accepted the principle of linguistic redistribution of Provinces as a clear political objective and in the following year the principle was adopted for the purpose of its reorganisation. On the heels of the appointment of the Indian Statutory Commission, in 1927, the Congress adopted a resolution

wherein it was stated that "the time has come for the redistribution of provinces on a linguistic basis" and that a beginning could be made by constituting Andhra, Utkal, Sind and Karnatak into separate provinces. Those supporting the resolution spoke of the right of self-determination of the people speaking the same language and following the same tradition and culture. Are we prepared to give this right of self-determination to such linguistic and cultural groups? It is this very right though in a modified form that was responsible for the creation of Pakistan by the *secession* of certain provinces and districts.

ALL PARTIES CONFERENCE

The Nehru Committee of the All Party Conference of 1928 examined this question too. The vehement and vocal support given by the Committee to the linguistic cause is traceable in these words:

"If a province has to educate itself and do its daily work through the medium of its own language, it must necessarily be a linguistic area. If it happens to be a polyglot area difficulties will continually arise and the media of instruction and work will be two or even more languages. Hence it becomes most desirable for provinces to be regrouped on a linguistic basis. Language as a rule corresponds with a special variety of culture, of traditions and literature. In a linguistic area all these factors will help in the general progress of the province."

It is however stimulating to state that the Committee recommended that the redistribution of provinces should take place on the basis of the wishes of the population, language and geographical, economic and financial principles. Hence the

importance of other factors—economic and financial—was slowly being realized. This was a slight shift from emotions and sentiments to practical reality, from dogmatism to pragmatic thinking. But it was just a beginning but the end was still on the horizon. Of all these factors, however, in the opinion of the Committee, "the main considerations must necessarily be the wishes of the people and the linguistic unity of the area concerned."

CONGRESS REAFFIRMATION

During the next two decades the Indian National Congress reaffirmed thrice its adherence to the linguistic principle. In 1937, it recommended the formation of the Andhra and Karnataka provinces; the very next year the Congress Working Committee gave an assurance to the deputationists from Andhra, Karnataka and Kerala that linguistic redistribution of the provinces would be undertaken as soon as the Congress had the power to do so; in the election manifesto of 1945-46, the Congress reiterated its view that administrative units should be constituted *as far as possible* on a linguistic and cultural basis; again with a small but significant difference in emphasis and reservation in thought.

GANDHIJI'S VIEW

Mahatma Gandhi's opinions on Linguistic Provinces as they appeared in the *Harijan* are worth a reproduction:

"The argument is that all Hindi-speaking areas should be regarded as one province, as also should Marathi-speaking areas. So far as I am concerned I am quite in sympathy with the suggestion. I believe that the linguistic basis is the correct basis for demarcating provinces. I should not mind two provinces speaking the

same language, if they are not contiguous. If Kerala and Kashmir were speaking the same language, I would treat them as two distinct provinces. The demand for amalgamation has to be made by Congressmen living in the respective areas. If it is unanimous, the Congress cannot resist it. The thing is entirely in their own hands.

Whilst on merits I endorse the proposal I would discountenance any such agitation and diversion from the main theme before the country—the duty of every Indian in face of the impending invasion of India by Japan. Redistribution of provinces etc., important matters though they are in themselves, pale into insignificance before the question which overshadows every other. These things may easily await the termination of the war. We hope to see a new vision and a new order at the end of the present catastrophe.” (April 1942).

Gandhiji referred to the provincial spirit that seemed to be infecting the provinces. Thus, he saw in the papers that some Assamese thought that Assam belonged exclusively to the Assamese. If that spirit fired every province, to whom could India belong? He held that the people of all the provinces belonged to India and India belonged to all. The only condition was that no one could go and settle in another province to exploit it or rule it or to injure its interest in any way. All were servants of India and they lived only in the spirit of service.

“But the reluctance to enforce linguistic redistribution is perhaps justifiable in the present depressing atmosphere. The exclusive spirit is ever uppermost. Everyone thinks

of himself and his family. No one thinks of the whole of India. The centripetal force is undoubtedly there, but it is not vocal, never boisterous; whereas the centrifugal is on the surface, and in its very nature makes the loudest noise, demanding the attention of all. It manifests itself most in matters communal. This has given rise to fear in other fields. The history of the quarrel between Orissa and Andhra, Orissa and Bihar, and Orissa and Bengal is fresh in our minds. The whole of it has not died out even now. This is but an illustration of an almost accomplished fact. The other provinces were never redistributed in law though they were in 1920 when the Congress had a brand new constitution enabling it to put up a life and death struggle with perhaps the greatest Empire that has ever been. How will Madras, though divided by the Congress divide itself into four provinces, and Bombay do likewise in law? Many other claimants have come to the fore. They are not recognised by the Congress, but they are not less vocal or less insistent. The Congress does not command the prestige and authority it found itself in possession of in 1920. Despair has given place to hope. Now, when we have freedom, we seem not to know what to do with it. It is almost mistaken for suicidal anarchy. Even zealous reformers would postpone controversial issues to a more hopeful time when, in the interest of the country, the virtue of ‘give and take’ would be freely recognized and all sectional interests would be subordinate to the one interest of the good of India, which will include the good of all.” (November 1947).

The view expressed by the Father of the Indian Nation in his last prayer speech of 25th January, 1948, alas, hardly a week before the untimely tragic end of our Babu is a good dis-

course on 'The Unity of India' for all of us to deliberate upon and digest. He said that they had been discussing the question of reconstitution of provinces on a linguistic basis. Further,

"The Congress had already adopted that principle and had declared its intention to give effect to it constitutionally as soon as they came to power, as such redistribution would be conducive to the cultural advancement of the country. But such redistribution should not militate against the organic unity of India. Autonomy did not and should not mean disruption, or that hereafter provinces could go the way they chose, independent of one another and of the Centre. If each province began to look upon itself as a separate, sovereign unit, India's independence would lose its meaning and with it would vanish the freedom of the various units as well." (February 1948).

Prime Minister Nehru addressing the Constituent Assembly on 27th November, 1947, soon after Partition, while conceding the linguistic principle, remarked in the same vein: "First things must come first and the first thing is the security and stability of India."

DAR COMMISSION

The demand for the formation of linguistic states was referred to the Dar Commission appointed by the President of the Constituent Assembly of India on June 17, 1948. The Commission was asked to examine and report on the formation of new provinces, of Andhra, Karnataka, Kerala and Maharashtra and on the administrative, financial and other consequences of the creation of such new provinces. The report submitted to the President of the Assembly on Decem-

ber 10, 1948, contained the following thought-provoking remarks:

"The evidence given before us brings out two sharply conflicting views in regard to the formation of these linguistic provinces and the time and circumstances in which they should be formed.

"The case for the formation of linguistic provinces rests upon two alternative grounds; upon the theory that these linguistic groups are sub-nations and as such contracting parties to the constitution from which the Federation and the Centre derive their existence and power; alternatively, it rests upon the unwieldy size of the existing provinces, their heterogeneous composition and the administrative advantage which may result from bringing together people speaking one language, in imparting education and in the working of courts, legislatures, governmental machinery and democratic institutions.

"The arguments in favour of the immediate formation of linguistic provinces are that on account of Congress pledges the demand has gone deep down into the masses and its postponement is creating bitterness, impatience and frustration, and the country cannot settle down to constructive work till the demand is conceded, and that the Constitution will start on a faulty basis without the linguistic provinces being put on its schedule.

"The case against the formation of these linguistic provinces rests upon the intolerance which they breed against the minority speaking a different language in the same province, the inter-provincial isolation and antagonisms which they bring into existence, the parochial patriotism which they emphasise as against the growth of the nascent national feeling, and lastly, the

bitterness which is likely to be generated as a result of marking off the boundaries of these provinces between rival claimants and the allotment of the capital cities of Madras and Bombay.

"The arguments in favour of its postponement are that the country is not yet free from the dangers of external aggression, that it is in the grip of an economic crisis of great magnitude, etc."

The conclusion was rightly arrived at by the Commission that 'the formation of provinces on exclusively or even mainly linguistic considerations is not in the larger interests of the Indian Nation and should not be taken in hand'. The Commission wisely went one step further in stating that "in the formation of new provinces, whenever such a work is taken in hand, oneness of language may be one of the factors to be taken into consideration along with others, but it should not be the 'decisive' or even the 'main' factor".

PUNJAB COMMISSION

Today what is the attitude of our provincial politicians and even some of our National leaders? They want, not only States to be divided into linguistic areas but districts, talukas and even villages. According to them, language and no other criterion should be given consideration in the Re-organisation of States or adjustment of boundaries. The terms of reference of the recent Punjab Commission under the Chairmanship of Justice J. C. Shah, a Supreme Judicial Authority with M/s. S. Dutt and M. N. Philip, retired civil servants, versatile in fields of foreign affairs and communications, which are subjects of vital significance in deciding the future of the partitioned parts of the present Punjab, as members,

indicates the current thinking of the Union Government and the Ruling party on the subject. They are briefly:

- (i) to examine the existing boundary of the Hindi and Punjabi regions of the present State of Punjab and recommend what adjustment, if any, are necessary in that boundary to secure the linguistic homogeneity of the proposed Punjab and Hariyana States;
- (ii) to indicate the boundaries of the hill areas of the present State of Punjab, which are contiguous to Himachal Pradesh and have linguistic and cultural affinity with that territory.

It is obvious that the formation of Hindi Hariyana and Sikhi Punjab is a *fait accompli*. Only a miracle or a drastic deterioration in the international situation could prevent the partition of the Punjab. Chandigarh may become Union territory and the seat of capitals of Hariyana and residual Punjab. This is a wise decision to experiment on the principle of co-existence.

BORDER PROBLEM

Why was this not tried while bifurcating the bigger Bilingual Bombay in 1960? The old border problem between Mysore and Maharashtra got aggravated very recently on the Congress High Command decision to appoint a one man commission. Mysore then gave a good demonstration of its capacity to copy Maharashtra in its pressure tactics to change decisions through seemingly popular and peaceful, but at times clearly violent, and more often than not, they led to the most undesirable type of activities and agitations. Both Mysore and Maharashtra however rightly argue that it does not matter if a few towns and villages are in one State or the other; after all they will continue to be in India. But our actions and behaviour do not exhibit

that worthy national sentiment. From all this, one cannot but arrive at the sad conclusion that we are still a set of peoples with parochial ideas, fissiparous tendencies and not a country which has achieved its Nationhood. India at best is a Nation in the making. The solidity that we feel and solidarity that is shown in fits and starts whenever our security is directly at stake, are only a symbol of India's Unity in Distress, rather than the popular proclamation of Unity in Diversity. Scratch the skin of many of our leaders, local, provincial, regional or national; you are mostly likely to find that the proclamation of nationalism and patriotism that they make in consonance with sacrifices that they made in the Fight for Freedom from British Bondage, is only a surface coating. Casteism, communalism and regionalism are rampant in the minds of small and big Indians, perhaps more in the latter than the former. When many of them speak about Freedom, Democracy and Socialism as also Planning for Defence and Development, it is both 'double think' and 'double talk' to which many of them have become accustomed during the last decade or more. From a policy of 'hasten slowly' towards rational Reorganisation of States, we are now marching with accelerated speed towards linguistic Fragmentation.

Is it in tune with the recommendations of the various sacrosanct Commissions and Committees appointed from time to time?

Are these Commissions and Committees only eye-washes and tools for political plunder and excuses for human blunders?

D. C. RECOMMENDATIONS

Let us now examine the fate of Dar Commission's recommendations. The Commission had emphasised that every-

thing which helped the growth of nationalism had to go forward and everything which impeded it had to be rejected or should stand over. Among many other factors which should be given due weight the Commission covered history, geography, economy and culture. The Commission listed certain "generally recognised" tests which a linguistic area must satisfy before it could be formed into a province. These were:

- (i) Geographical contiguity and absence of pockets and corridors;
- (ii) financial self-sufficiency;
- (iii) administrative convenience;
- (iv) capacity for future development; and
- (v) a large measure of agreement within borders and amongst the people speaking the same language in regard to its formation, care being taken that the new province should not be forced by a majority upon a substantial minority of people speaking the same language.

J.V.P. COMMITTEE

To review the position in the light of the report of the Dar Commission and the new problems that had arisen since Independence, the Indian National Congress appointed a top level Committee at its Jaipur Session in December 1948 itself. The Committee, known as J.V.P. Committee which consisted of Prime Minister, Sardar Vallabhbhai Patel (Home Minister) and Dr. Pattabhi Sitaramayya (Congress President) was the first Congress body composed of Heads of the organisational and administrative wings to sound a note of warning against the linguistic principles. A committee with better talent, political sagacity and human experience, was and still

is difficult, perhaps impossible to think of. No politicians or public men with greater sincerity and perspective, deeper sense of nationalism and patriotism, were in existence then, nor are there any in India today. This super-Committee categorically stated:

- (a) when the Congress had given the seal of its approval to the general principle of linguistic provinces, it was not faced with the practical application of the principle and hence it had not considered all the implications and consequences that arose from this practical application;
- (b) the primary consideration must be the security, unity and economic prosperity of India and every separatist and disruptive tendency should be rigorously discouraged;
- (c) language was not only a binding force but also a separating one; and
- (d) the old Congress policy of having linguistic provinces could only be applied after careful thought had been given to each separate case and without creating serious administrative dislocation or mutual conflicts which would jeopardise the political and economic stability of the country.

The committee however admitted that public sentiment if insistent and overwhelming will have to be respected subject to two limitations which in brief were:

- (i) at least in the beginning, the principle might be applied to well defined undisputed areas;
- (ii) all the proposals which merit consideration could not be implemented simultaneously.

In other words the Committee cautioned against any quick step and suggested that a beginning could be made with the creation of Andhra. What better advice could be expected from men who had the most glorious record of selfless service to the nation? They were long-sighted men unlike many who could not see beyond the nose. The Congress Working Committee endorsed the J.V.P. report and followed the same line of thought in the election manifesto of 1951.

OTHER PARTIES

The linguistic reconstitution of States naturally figured prominently in the election manifesto of all political parties. It was vital for catching votes. The Socialist Party was in favour, subject to geographical contiguity and economic viability. The Communists stood for national States enjoying wide powers including the right of self-determination for each linguistic unit. The Kisan Mazdoor Praja Party (the precursor of the present Praja Socialist Party and Samyukta Socialist Party) advocated the appointment of a high power committee to go into the whole question of the redistribution of States including the question of bilingual border areas. The Hindu Maha Sabha believed in the policy of formation of provinces on a linguistic basis but desired that due regard should be paid to the problem of defence and to other factors like area and economic stability.

ANDHRA STATE

In accordance with the J.V.P. report, Prime Minister Nehru stated in the Parliament in December 1952, that Government could proceed with the formation of the Andhra State. After the death of the now famous Potti Sriramulu, the Government of India announced their decision to establish the State of Andhra "consisting of the Telugu-speaking

areas of the present Madras State but not including the City of Madras". Accordingly, on the basis of the reports submitted by Justice Wanchoo in February 1953 and the findings of Justice Misra about the future of Bellary taluk, the first new linguistic State of Andhra, came into existence on 1st October 1953, given as a gift as if for the martyrdom of Sriramulu.

CONSTITUTIONAL POSITION

Art. 3 (as amended by the Act of 1955) of the Constitution of India, which we gave to ourselves through the Constituent Assembly on 26th November 1949 and under which we are being governed since 26th January 1950, lays down: Parliament may by law—

- (a) form a new State by separation of territory from any State or by uniting two or more States or parts of States or by uniting any territory to a part of any State;
- (b) increase the area of any State;
- (c) diminish the area of any State;
- (d) alter the boundaries of any State;
- (e) alter the name of any State;

Provided that no Bill for the purpose shall be introduced in either House of Parliament except on the recommendation of the President and unless, where the proposal contained in the Bill affects the area, boundaries or name of any of the States, the Bill has been referred by the President to the Legislature of that State for expressing its view thereon within such period as may be specified in the reference or within such further period as the President may allow and the period so specified or allowed has expired.

Hence the Indian Parliament is paramount and supreme and has full authority, powers and responsibility in respect of boundaries of States subject to consultation (and consent in the case of Jammu and Kashmir) with State Legislatures concerned. An Act for Reorganisation of State is not subject to the restrictions laid down in Art. 368, for the Amendment of the Constitution.

STATES REORGANISATION COMMISSION

The formation of the new linguistic State of Andhra became a stepping stone for local politicians especially of the multi-lingual States of Madras and Bombay to raise a hue and cry for an overall reorganisation of States. Hence Prime minister Nehru was obliged to make a statement on 22nd December 1953, to the effect that a Commission would be appointed to examine 'objectively and dispassionately' the question of the reorganisation of the States of the Indian Union 'so that the welfare of the people of each constituent unit as well as the nation as a whole is promoted'.

The Commission consisting of Justice Saiyid Fazl Ali (the then Governor of Orissa), Pandit Hriday Nath Kunzru, Member of the Council of States and Sardar Kavalam Madhava Panikkar, eminent historian-statesman, all senior public men of the highest integrity, was announced by Ministry of Home Affairs' Resolution dated the 29th December 1953. The first three paragraphs quoted below give the background of the problem:

- "1. The Government of India have been giving careful consideration to the problem of the States which are constituent units of the Indian Union. These States, as they exist today, are largely the result of historical processes and the spread and consolidation of the British Power in India. On the attainment of Inde-

pendence, India was partitioned and the independent State of Pakistan was created. A process of merger and integration took place in regard to what were then called the Indian States. This integration of the old Indian States, which was brought about within a very short period, was an event of historic significance. The integration, however, was naturally based to a large extent on the old pattern which existed before independence.

2. The pattern of States in the Union is thus the result of historical accident and circumstances. Their mere existence for a hundred years or more developed political, administrative and cultural associations within and between them.
3. The greater development of political consciousness among the people and the growing importance of the great regional languages led gradually to demands for the formation of certain States on a linguistic basis. Each such separate problem was however closely inter-related with other problems, and any formation of a new state necessarily affected a number of other States. It thus became increasingly difficult to consider any such problem in isolation."

TERMS OF REFERENCE

Although the Commission was given full discretion to consider any proposal or principle bearing on reorganisation, some broad principles which should govern the consideration of the problem, were laid in paragraph 4 of the Resolution of 29th December 1953, which read thus:

"The language and culture of an area have an undoubted importance as they represent a pattern of living which

is common in that area. In considering a reorganisation of States, however, there are other important factors which have also to be borne in mind. The first essential consideration is the preservation and strengthening of the unity and security of India. Financial, economic and administrative considerations are almost equally important, not only from the point of view of each State, but for the whole nation. India has embarked upon a great ordered plan for her economic, cultural and moral progress. Changes which interfere with the successful prosecution of such a national plan would be harmful to the national interest."

The principles that emerge from this guidepost could be enumerated as follows:—

- (i) preservation and strengthening of the unity and security of India;
- (ii) linguistic and cultural homogeneity;
- (iii) financial, economic and administrative considerations;
- (iv) successful working of the national plan.

Is it not therefore highly disturbing and even annoying to find that the same ruling party and leaders of public opinion have thrown these principles to the winds and are dividing and subdividing the country into fragments, molecules and even atoms based on one single language test by rousing the sentiment of the ignorant masses?

FACTORS FOR CONSIDERATION—S.R.C.

Speaking about the factors having a bearing on Reorganisation, the Commission stated thus:

"After a full consideration of the problem in all its aspects, we have come to the conclusion that it is neither

possible nor desirable to reorganise States on the basis of the single test of either language or culture, but that a balanced approach to the whole problem is necessary in the interests of our national unity.

Such a balanced approach would appear to be :

- (a) to recognise linguistic homogeneity as an important factor conducive to administrative convenience and efficiency but not to consider it as an exclusive and binding principle, over-riding all other considerations, administrative, financial or political;
- (b) to ensure that communicational, educational and cultural needs of different language groups, whether resident in predominantly unilingual or composite administrative units, are adequately met;
- (c) where satisfactory conditions exist, and the balance of economic, political and administrative considerations favour composite States, to continue them with the necessary safeguards to ensure that all sections enjoy equal rights and opportunities;
- (d) to repudiate the "home land" concept, which negates one of the fundamental principles of the Indian constitution, namely, equal opportunities and equal rights for all citizens throughout the length and breadth of the Union;
- (e) to reject the theory of "one language one state", which is neither justified on grounds of linguistic homogeneity, because there can be more than one State speaking the same language without offending the linguistic principle, nor practicable, since different language groups, including the vast Hindi-speaking population of the Indian Union, cannot always be consolidated to form distinct linguistic units; and

- (f) finally, to the extent that the realisation of unilingualism at state level would tend to breed a particularist feeling, to counter-balance that feeling by positive measures calculated to give a deeper content to Indian nationalism; to promote greater inter-play of different regional cultures, and interstate co-operation and accord; and to reinforce the links between the Centre and the State in order to secure a greater co-ordinated working of national policies and programmes."

The Commission further remarked

"The problems of reorganisation vary from region to region. It has to be kept in mind that the interplay for centuries of historical, linguistic, geographical, economic and other factors has produced peculiar patterns in different regions. Each case, therefore, has its own background. Besides, the problems of reorganisation are so complex that it would be unrealistic to determine any case by a single test alone. All the committees and commissions which have previously gone into the matter such as the Dar Commission and the J.V.P. Committee have rightly expressed themselves against a monistic approach to the problem. We have, accordingly, examined each case on its own merits and in its own context and arrived at conclusions after taking into consideration the totality of circumstances and on an overall assessment of the solutions proposed."

RECOMMENDS REORGANISATION

The Commission favoured reorganisation of States on the above rationale for,

"At the time of their integration the former princely states were in different stages of development. Some

transitional expedients had, therefore, to be adopted to fit these units into the constitutional structure of India which added to the disparities already existing between British Indian provinces. These disparities led to the classification of the States of the Indian Union into three categories, namely, Part A, Part B and Part C States."

Further,

"No State of the Indian Union represents a pre-existing sovereign unit. A special feature of the Indian Constitution is that it empowers Parliament to admit or establish new States, to increase or diminish the area of an existing State or to alter its boundaries."

At present our Constitution has no provision for the merger of the territories of any State with a Union territory or *vice versa*.

REORGANISED STATES

After an "objective and dispassionate" analysis of a very complicated problem, the Commission, in order that posterity may not curse the present generation for opening out the doors and windows of the glass house when there were already clear signs of the incoming storm, proposed the formation of the States of Madras, Kerala, Karnataka, Hyderabad, Andhra, Bombay, Vidarbha, Madhya Pradesh, Rajasthan, Punjab, Uttar Pradesh, Bihar, West Bengal, Assam, Orissa and Jammu & Kashmir, on a rational and not so much an emotional basis. The (residual) State of Hyderabad was to merge with Andhra after the general elections of 1961-62; hence the number of States would be only 15. In the Eighth Schedule of our Constitution there are 14 languages which could be called State or regional languages, viz., Assamese, Bengali, Gujarati, Hindi, Kannada, Kashmiri, Malayalam, Marathi, Oriya, Punjabi, Sanskrit, Tamil, Telugu and Urdu.

Of these Sanskrit and Urdu are out of question in the formation of linguistic states. On a purely linguistic consideration, there ought to have been 12 States. But Vidarbha, Madhya Pradesh, Rajasthan and Bihar were important cultural units whose popular sentiments deserved due consideration. Because of very old ties and binding association between Gujarati and Marathi-speaking people with Bombay as nucleus, it was very rightly felt, that the old Bombay State, devoid of the Abu Road taluk and the district of Dharwar, Bijapur, North Kanara and Belgaum, and with the addition of the Marathi-speaking districts of Hyderabad, namely, Osmanabad, Bhir, Aurangabad, Parbhani and Nanded, as also Saurashtra and Kutch, should form a strong bilingual State of Bombay.

BILINGUAL STATES

This was indeed a beautiful and bold recommendation worthy of a sincere experimentation of internal peaceful co-existence which India was preaching day in and day out to the outside world. In fact there were many intellectuals who strongly felt that this example should be emulated throughout India and suggested integration of other unilingual States into more bilingual units. Thus the whole country, leaving aside the Union territories of Delhi, Himachal Pradesh, Manipur, Tripura, the Andaman and Nicobar Islands, and the Laccadive, Minicoy and Amindivi Islands which, in the context of our present analysis are minor elements, could well be divided into the nine States with Capitals at Calcutta (Assam and Bengal), Hyderabad (Andhra and Karnataka), Madras (Madras and Kerala), Jamshedpur (Bihar and Orissa), Bhopal (Madhya Pradesh), Lucknow (Uttar Pradesh), Jaipur (Punjab and Rajasthan), Bombay (Maharashtra and Gujarat) and Srinagar (Jammu and Kashmir). Nagaland

and Kashmir could be integrated with adjoining States at the right time. The population in crores and area in lakhs of square kilometers of States with these respective capitals, on the basis of 1961 census figures will, approximately be as follows:—

- (i) Bhopal—3.24 crores/4.43 lakhs
- (ii) Bombay—6.02/4.94
- (iii) Calcutta—4.74/3.06
- (iv) Hyderabad—5.96/4.67
- (v) Jaipur—4.04/4.64
- (vi) Jamshedpur—6.39/3.30
- (vii) Lucknow—7.37/2.94
- (viii) Madras—5.06/1.69
- (ix) Srinagar—2.23/0.36

These States will mostly be bilingual, medium in size and viable, economic and financial units.

OPINION OF YOUTH

In June-July the author sought an opportunity to know the mind of the Indian youth numbering over 550 coming from all parts of India, Kashmir to Kerala and Gujarat to Assam. These were all first class engineers—chemical, civil, electrical and mechanical—drawn from almost all the important universities and the five Institutes of Technology. In groups of about 5, they were asked to discuss amongst other subjects, freely and frankly, but with objectivity and on a rational basis, topics like—(i) Reorganisation of States, from the formation of Andhra Pradesh to the proposed partition of Punjab, (ii) Performance of Mrs. Indira Gandhi as the Prime Minister of India and the question of her continuation after the next General Elections (iii) Merits and Demerits of

the recent Devaluation of the Rupee, (iv) Hindi as the official language of India. Opinions of these pioneers in Engineering and Technology, representing a good intellectual cross section of India, was almost unanimously against reorganisation purely on a linguistic basis. Many preferred undoing the linguistic menace through the formation of zones, on the basis either of natural physical features or longitudes and latitudes. They all seemed against the reopening of the border issues and except one or two, these pioneers were not happy with the proposed partition of the Punjab. The writer has always been in favour of Bilingual States as a good compromise between purely unilingual states as contemplated at present and the polyglot provinces of the past.

FURTHER MOVES

However to implement such a proposal in the larger interest of the Nation, especially posterity, a nation needs men with both courage and conviction. Prime Minister Jawaharlal Nehru was one such bold and popular leader but on this issue he became chicken hearted in the interest of the Congress Party and surrendered national interests. In a democracy on vital issues which concern the future of the country as a whole, leaders have to lead the people with firmness and exercise authority if persuasion fails. But our Nehru was too much of a democrat. In the bigger bilingual Bombay experiment, the Congress leadership, being politically not mature enough to face the opposition manoeuvres, let the Prime Minister down and at last the demon of linguism was let loose by forming the unilingual states of Maharashtra and Gujarat increasing in each State the parochial spirit and partisan outlook, detrimental to the interest of the nation. Is the problem still solved? There is now a move for merger of Belgaum, Karwar and Nipani; old Portuguese Goa

too. The demand for transfer of Dang District is also revived. There is a desire to separate Saurashtra and the strategic Kutch from Gujarat; a move is made to divide Mysore into two States too.

WHY SPLIT UP PUNJAB ?

We have not stopped there. Every one of these halts is going to be for grabbing more at the next available opportunity. Who thinks these days much of the thousands of square kilometres of Indian territory usurped by Communist China? The current proposal of the Union Government to divide the border State of Punjab into two unilingual States is a logical deduction of wrong premises with which Government started, and opened out the hornet's nest. Perhaps the granting of the claim of the Akali Dal for the Punjabi Suba is a reward to the Sikhs for their courageous contribution during the 22 fateful days of Indo-Pakistan conflict in September 1965. Was there no other way of rewarding the community except by partitioning the glorious and powerful Punjab? There is a small silver lining too. Two days after the announcement of the terms of reference of the Punjab Commission, this is what the 'Poona Herald' said in an editorial:

"There is no doubt that parochialism has become a sort of curse to the nation. This spirit has been further inculcated as a result of the linguistic split up of the country.

The stage has come when we have begun to talk of nothing else but our own states while we seem to be concerned with the country as a whole."

* * * *

"At the present moment when the country is torn by linguistic differences there should be virtually an up-

heaval in the nation to bind the people together through common bonds of friendship and unity.

It some times seems difficult to believe that we are all people of one country. So marked are our differences and our bias towards each other."

FUTURE

All said and done, with the best of motives, the new State of Punjab will have a communal colour. In the pre-1947 days, the All-India Muslim League gave repeated assurances that once the Congress conceded the demand for Pakistan, Hindustan and Pakistan could live in lasting amity as good and great brothers. No Indian need be told what our neighbourly relations today are and what they are likely to be in future. Co-existence, that too internally of a communal State within secular India cannot last too long. A communal Sikh State of Punjab, by whatever name it is called, will make way for complete subsequent secession from the Indian Union and may strive to remain a separate independent entity to serve as a buffer between India and West Pakistan, perhaps like Bhutan, Sikkim or Nepal which fall between India and Communist China. How can we stop in future a demand for splitting up U.P. into Agra State with an area of 51,346 sq. miles and the residual State with an area of 74,998 square miles as recommended by the minority note of Sardar Panikkar? What about separation of Vidarbha and Konkan from Maharashtra? The former was recommended by S.R.C. and for the latter a Memorandum was submitted to the Linguistic Provinces Commission of 1948. The problem of merger of Goa and Karwar etc. will automatically appear to be solved by the formation of Konkan State. Eventually each State is bound to show further splitting tendencies demanding greater and greater autonomy, concomitantly

weakening the Centre. We should not be surprised if in a generation's time the Southern States demand secession because of alleged domination and discrimination in services by the Northerners. By the hair-splitting of process, such people could argue that ever since 1946, for two decades we have been under U.P. Hindi Prime Ministers. In the Cabinet it would not be merit that could be of any value but region, language, community, caste, sub-caste and what not. Heaven help us from these political tragedies!

OFFICIAL LANGUAGE

The next question that needs some attention is the official language—the *Lingua Franca* of India which under the Constitution shall be Hindi in Devanagari script. But for 15 years from 1950, 'the English language shall continue to be used for all the official purposes of the Union for which it was being used immediately before such commencement'. We know very well the reaction in non-Hindi areas to a formal attempt in implementing this provision in the Constitution. Art. 351 lays down that:

"It shall be duty of the Union to promote the spread of the Hindi language, to develop it so that it may serve as a medium of expression for all the elements of the composite culture of India and to secure its enrichment by assimilating without interfering with its genius, the forms, style and expression used in Hindustani and in other languages of India specified in the Eighth Schedule, and by drawing, wherever necessary or desirable, for its vocabulary, primarily on Sanskrit and secondarily on other languages."

These provisions clearly admit the inadequacy of the present Hindi to be the Union official language in preference to English and yet, *pseudo* national sentiments demanded the

provision of a modal, but not a majority language Hindi, to be declared as our *Lingua Franca*. During the last 15 years, the international importance of English as a World language has grown beyond imagination. English is now the most prominent vehicle of modern thought, science, engineering and technology. The South from the point of view of parity in disadvantage, prefers English to Hindi as the *de facto* official language whatever the *de jure* position may be. The opinion of the non-Hindi areas was strongly advocated by Dr. Suniti Kumar Chatterji and Dr. P. Subbarayan in their Notes of Dissent to the Report of the Official Language Commission of 1955-56, appointed under Art. 344 of the Constitution of India. Dr. Chatterji in his minority report remarked thus:

"A language cannot be developed to order, and the preparation of a time-schedule before a language is actually developed will be futile and exasperating because it is impossible of achievement. As Sri K. M. Munshi has pertinently observed: "Unless Hindi becomes in some measure a powerful instrument of expression in the hands of the educated men, it cannot replace English as a language of power". The mind of the people must be first modernised, and sufficiently advanced in both science and culture before its language can become an adequate vehicle for the expression of the mentality of a modern and progressive people, in politics as much as in other departments of life.

It will finally rest with the different States using their own regional languages to decide, after Hindi has been voluntarily adopted by them and a knowledge of it has spread among their intelligentsia, to what extent Hindi can be used for communication between the Union and the State Governments and between one State Government and another."

Dr. Subbarayan stated:

"The Commission did a tremendous amount of work in securing and sifting evidence and opinion under the able and patient guidance of our distinguished Chairman, Shri B.G. Kher. Unfortunately unanimity has not been possible as the majority of members having considered the opinions expressed by witnesses from non-Hindi-speaking States, particularly from Bengal, Madras and Mysore which are of no mean importance with regard to history, area, population and general advancement, were not able to accept what was suggested. My point of view, which I expressed clearly during the deliberations of the commission, I found basically differed from those of most of my colleagues. I found no reason to change this point of view and on the contrary, the evidence gathered during the inquiry particularly in Bengal, Madras and Mysore and many distinguished persons of learning and experience in public life from other States supported this view and I cannot help feeling disappointed that my colleagues were not able to accept these opinions in arriving at their conclusions. I am glad however that I found that Dr. S. K. Chatterji and I looked at the problem with the same sympathy and understanding and that therefore there was much common ground in our views and agreement on essential points."

Speaking about the unity of India he further said:

"The recent events in many parts of India have brought home to me the imperative necessity to keep intact our most precious treasure of Indian unity. It is, therefore, important to consider seriously about the extent to which we should push Hindi and speed with which we should try to make it the official language of India.

Many honestly feel that there are already signs of the danger of an incipient "Hindi Imperialism" which will be all the more anti-national as Hindi has not yet acquired any pre-eminence over the other languages of India except its weight of numbers. The Hindi-speaking people, like all human beings, are not free from linguism and their expectations have been raised very high. It is also my conviction, after careful observation and thinking, that the relegation of English to a secondary place in our education and public life will certainly not be for the good of the country. Hence I venture to differ from the findings and recommendations of the majority of the commission and present my specific proposals."

There is therefore, no surprise that not only the report has been almost shelved but the second official language Commission, which ought to have been constituted in 1960, was never appointed.

DR. B. R. AMBEDKAR

The opinion of Dr. Ambedkar, the Chief Architect of our Constitution as the Central Law Minister, deserves serious attention. In his Memorandum to the Linguistic Provinces Commission of 1948, he said:

"In discussing the question of creating such Linguistic Provinces it would be very short-sighted to omit from one's consideration the fact that the structure of Government of India of the future is to be cast in a dual form: (a) a Central Government and (b) a number of Provincial Governments inextricably inter-linked and interwoven in the discharge of their respective Legislative, Executive and Administrative functions. Before one could agree to the creation of Linguistic Provinces, one

must, therefore, consider the effects which Linguistic Provinces would have on the working of the Central Government.

Among the many effects that may be envisaged, the following are obvious:

(1) Linguistic Provinces will result in creating as many nations as there are groups with pride in their race, language and literature. The Central Legislature will be a League of Nations and the Central Executive may become a meeting of separate and solidified nations filled with the consciousness of their being separate in culture and therefore in interests. They may develop the mentality of political insubordination i.e. refusal to obey the majority or of staging walkouts. The development of such a mentality is not to be altogether discounted. If such a mentality grows it may easily make the working of the Central Government impossible.

The Creation of Linguistic Provinces would be fatal to the maintenance of the necessary administrative relations between the Centre and the Provinces. If each Province adopts its own language as its official language the Central Government will have to correspond in as many official languages as there are Linguistic Provinces. This must be accepted as an impossible task. How great a deadlock Linguistic Provinces will create in the working of the Government machine can be better understood by studying the effects of Linguistic Provinces on the Judiciary. In the new set up, each Province will have a High Court with a series of subordinate courts below it. At the apex of these High Courts, will be the Supreme Court with the right to hear appeals against the decisions of the High Courts. On the basis of Linguistic Provinces, Courts of each Province

including its High Court will conduct their proceedings in the language of the Province. What is the Supreme Court to do when its jurisdiction is invoked for rectifying a wrong done by the High Court? The Supreme Court will have to close down. For, if it is to function, every Judge of the Supreme Court—I am omitting for the moment the lawyers practising therein—must know the language of every Province which it is impossible to provide for.

No one can contemplate such a situation with equanimity. It may lead to break-up of India. Instead of remaining united, India may end in becoming Europe—faced with the prospect of chaos and disorder."

About official language, his opinion was:

"While accepting the principle of Linguistic Provinces it must provide against the break-up of India's unity. My solution of the problem therefore is that, while accepting the demand for the re-constitution of Provinces on Linguistic basis, the Constitution should provide that the official language of every Province shall be the same as the official language of the Central Government. It is only on that footing that I am prepared to accept the demand for Linguistic Provinces."

None of the Hindi patriots accept English nor do the non-Hindi States agree to have Hindi as the official language for their linguistic Provinces. Hence the linguistic paradox between the Union and the States, which affects national unity, cannot be solved by the formation of unilingual States.

DEFENCE AND DEVELOPMENT

The next decade or two are going to be crucial from the point of view of both defence and development for India.

At the end of our three five year Plans we were expecting to reach the take off stage. However our performance so far especially in 1965-66, has left much to be desired. We have dissipated our energies in trivial matters and the question of Indian poverty has not received the much needed attention that it deserves. The people also have been too docile in general except in respect of linguistic demands in some cities and they have been happy and satisfied with slogans, shadows and symbols like linguistic States, observance of jayantis rather than substance of freedom, democracy, social justice or socialism. Some men could be cheated all the time, all men could be deceived some times, but all men cannot be fooled all the time. India has been the bastion of Freedom and Democracy in Asia, and Africa too. When democracy was getting smothered in our surrounding areas and the newly won freedom is yet to be consolidated, we in our country have been fairly successful in our bold experiment with the parliamentary system of democracy on the basis of adult suffrage. Our middle path technique of planning with a democratic apparatus with a view to achieve our socio-economic goals has stood the test of time though we have under-shot the targets. But our war against internal poverty is now threatened by divisive tendencies inside and Sino-Pakistani military collaboration on our northern borders outside. Defence and development go hand in hand with each other. For defence we should be economically strong enough to face all trials and tribulations. Hence all our resources—human and material—should be put to optimum utility and equal priority should be given to war against poverty, disease, and ignorance. Pakistan and China are marking time. We wish them well. But wisdom lies in hoping for the best while being prepared for the worst. We are fortunate that most Nations are friendly towards us. Only Pakistan and China are still unfriendly. Indonesia, whose fight for Merdeka was conti-

nuously supported by India, particularly by our Jawaharlal Nehru, became a sworn enemy under the leadership of the same Dr. Sukarno who was earlier so friendly with India. Good that the tide has again turned and Communist China has learnt a lesson there. 1962 and 1965 were again critical years for India. The prestige that we had lost against China's onslaughts in 1962 has been restored fully in our successful operation against Pakistan's aggression and infiltration. Every Indian irrespective of caste, creed, region or political thought except the so-called left communists rose to the occasion like one man in the defence of our Motherland and saved the honour of our flag which fluttered high. If the same spirit is invigorated for development purposes, keeping aside all other minor issues, which the next generation could tackle better with fortitude, in the next 15 to 30 years we could be the foremost Nation in Asia from all points of view; and to touch or irritate us, any country will have to think thrice, though we will always strive to serve the cause of world peace. Today we are a poor country. Our National Income which in 1948-49 was Rs. 8,650 crores, increased in 1963-64 to Rs. 17,200 crores in money value; but in real terms, at constant price level, was only 13,910 crores. Individually the *per capita* income rose from a paltry Rs. 250/- in 1948-49 to a poor Rs. 300/- in real terms in 1963-64. During the Second Plan the rise in real income was Rs. 2,250/- crores, though in money terms Rs. 4,160 crores, showing 22% and 42% rise respectively. In the first four years of the Third Plan, real income had gone up Rs. 2,320 crores and monetary income Rs. 5,870, giving percentage rise of 18 and 42. These are still indicators of poverty rather than economic prestige and hence the imperative necessity of channelising all our energies to give real meaning to freedom from want. Then only we shall be able to speak firmly from a position of strength. With the untimely

devaluation of our Rupee, what is in store for all of us, before and after the next General Elections is any body's guess!

MIDDLE PATH

In general our National policies have been sound and sober. There could be errors of omission and commission during the process of implementation. Under the leadership of our Prime Minister Nehru, we were able to mark out a middle path in almost all walks of our National life in tune with the teachings of Lord Buddha, known the World over as the Light of Asia. We have formulated a system of Mixed Economy and planning with a democratic apparatus to achieve social justice through democratic socialism. India is moving mid-way between undiluted democracy and radical socialism. So also in respect of *Lingua Franca*. While Hindi is the Official Language under the Constitution, English has almost an equal status as the Associated language. The importance given to this question by Prime Minister Nehru could be gauged from his reference to Articles 29, 30, 350A and 350B in August 1961, at the time of the National Integration Conference. He also referred to the Government of India's Memorandum of 4th September 1956, which had been prepared after considering the recommendations of the States Reorganisation Commission in regard to safeguards for linguistic minorities. Sorry to say that the implementation of these safeguards by the local leaders have been half-hearted and has lead to burning dissatisfaction and discontent. In July 1966, a responsible member of the Bombay Municipal Corporation made a suggestion that in view of the water scarcity in Bombay, non-Maharashtrians should be asked to leave Bombay. Who are the non-Maharashtrians? All those who have settled down in Bombay and Maharashtra or have such a sincere desire irrespective of their Mother-tongue or

the language they speak, are undoubtedly Maharashtrians. We cannot forget that there is only a single citizenship for Indians and every Indian has the freedom to settle down in any part of the country except Kashmir for the time being. It is therefore a pity that in fact in many States, linguistic intolerance is growing and after some years, migration from one State to another may become extremely difficult and painful. Then why not adopt a compromise middle path in the art of Reorganisation of States and take the important step of enlarging each State, instead of dividing them further. Thus we would strengthen India and the Central Government.

DISPASSIONATE AND OBJECTIVE STUDY

The main object of this dispassionate and objective study has been to focus attention on the need to cry a halt to this painful process of linguistic fragmentation which would lead to India's liquidation as a balanced and well respected member in the comity of nations. As practical men, we do see the impracticability of undoing immediately the harm already caused by the Reorganisation of States purely on linguistic lines. But further harm could certainly be stalled. No discrimination in appointments at any level in the public services or in private industries or firms on the basis of language, caste or creed or region should be encouraged. Good knowledge of either English, Hindi or the regional language should be considered enough for appointments.

SUGGESTIONS

Hence it is suggested that (i) English and Hindi be declared official languages at the Union as well as State levels in all States; but public should be free to correspond in the language of their choice; (ii) No further sub-division of any State should be either attempted or permitted and the present bound-

daries of the States be retained as they are till 1976; (iii) Steps be slowly taken to merge smaller border states with the neighbouring states; (iv) The Constitution be amended if necessary to achieve the objectives of Defence and Development and for strengthening the Centre; (v) From 1975 the process of integration of States into Bilingual regions be initiated after detailed study.

Instead of therefore swimming with the current, the present political leadership should face the challenge of change, rise to the occasion and sacrifice even their personal prestige by channelizing the human tide of thought in the right direction. Is it too much to expect the present leadership to stand still and maintain the *status quo* of State boundaries? If the leadership fails to rise to the occasion and does not stall further vivisection, posterity in the glittering words of Khalil Gibran, will alas "Pity the nation whose sages are dumb with years and whose strong men are yet in the cradle. Pity the nation divided into fragments, each fragment deeming itself a nation."